



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,856	09/27/2000	Naoaki Komiya	YKI-0050	6714

7590

02/11/2003

Michael A Cantor Esq  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/671,856

Applicant(s)

KOMIYA ET AL.

Examiner

Kimnhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-12-02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. The claims 1-2 are pending. The examination results are as following.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being anticipated by Prior Art figure 3 admitted by Applicant.

Regarding claim 1, Prior Art figure 3 discloses that an active matrix type electroluminescence display device comprising a plurality of display pixels (GS1, GS2, GS3) arranged in a matrix of rows and columns, each of the display pixels including an electroluminescence element (11) to which one end of a capacitance for maintaining a voltage (VH) corresponding to a display signal is connected; and a capacitance line (17) extending each row and connected to and shared by the other end of the capacitance (13) of the display pixels; wherein the constant (VSC) is supplied from end of the capacitance line. However, Prior Art figure 3 does not disclose a plurality of capacitance lines extending in each row. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to install a plurality of capacitance lines extending in each row in the Prior Art because Prior Art only shows one pixel, it should have more

Art Unit: 2674

pixels are wellknown in the prior art that does not show, therefore they will more capacitances lines.

Regarding claim 2, Prior Art figure 3 discloses that an active matrix type electroluminescence display device comprising a plurality pixels, each including an electroluminescence element arranged in a matrix of rows and column, a first thin film transistor (12) in which a display signal is applied to the drain and which is switched on and off in response to select signal, a capacitance (13) having one end connected to the source (VSC) of the first thin film transistor (12) and for maintaining a voltage corresponding to the display signal, and a second thin film transistor (14) for driving the electroluminesce element based on the display signal; and a capacitance lines (17) extending each row and connected to and shared by the other end of the capacitance (13) of the display pixels. However, Prior Art figure 3 does not disclose a plurality of first capacitance lines, each extending for a row and connected to and shared by the other end of a capacitance in the display pixels; and a plurality of second capacitance lines connected to and shared by both ends of the plurality of first capacitance lines. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to install disclose a plurality of first capacitance lines, each extending for a row and connected to and shared by the other end of a capacitance in the display pixels; and a plurality of second capacitance lines connected to and shared by both ends of the plurality of first capacitance lines to the figure 3 in Prior Art because Prior Art only shows one pixel, it should have more pixels are wellknown in the art that does not show, therefore

Art Unit: 2674

they will have a plurality of first capacitance lines and a plurality of second capacitance lines.

***Response to arguments***

3. Applicant argues that the claimed invention includes “a plurality of capacitance lines and shared by the other end of said capacitance of said display pixels” or a plurality of second capacitance lines connected to and shared by both ends of said plurality of first capacitance lines”. However, this argument is not persuasive because these would be wellknown in the Prior Art as explained above.

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessfully, the examiner’s supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on **(703) 305-4709**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231

**Or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).**

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2674

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen  
February 6, 2003



RICHARD WERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600